UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,507	02/05/2004	Taejoon Kwon	YPL0080US	6812
23413 CANTOR COL	7590 03/12/200 LBURN, LLP	EXAMINER		
20 Church Stree 22nd Floor		ZHOU, SHUBO		
Hartford, CT 06103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/773,507	KWON, TAEJOON	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov	er sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day a application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an a application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The periods:	mendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final	rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MOI Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	(2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In NTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petit have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the cunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutor set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	orresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee y period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 C filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (3 Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time peaments.	7 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the c	date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for app</li> </ul>	or search (see NOTE below);
appeal; and/or  (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding n	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	. ,
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attache	d Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if subminon-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	itted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be e how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or a The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 1,2,4-7,9-12 and 15. Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-7,9-12 and 15. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasonable not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of App entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> reje showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not ea	ections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status on REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT plan.	ce the application in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Pa	aper No(s)
	3O (Joe) ZHOU/ y Examiner, Art Unit 1631

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

## Continuation of 11:

The amended independent claims 1, 7, and 12 are objected to because each thereof contains two periods at the end. Their independent claims are objected to for being dependent therefrom.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 15 under 35 USC 103(a), applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument is mainly on the ground that Benson et al. is silent with respect to at least a location estimation unit, and the Office fails to provide evidence documenting that Benson does in fact disclose a unit performing elements of determining a reference group, etc. See page 9 of 11 of the response filed 2/11/09. In summary, the arguments are focused on that Benson does not disclose the "unit" for performing the functions recited in the claims. This is not found persuasive. With regard to the location estimation unit, as set forth in the previous Office action, mailed 12/12/08, on page 4, Benson et al. disclose displaying the location of the query/target sequence in the various database record sequences in the form of alignments. It would have been readily apparent and/or obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that in order to display the locations, the GenBank system disclosed by Benson et al. must have contained a unit to determine or at least estimate the locations. As to applicant's assertion that the Office fails to provide evidence that Benson disclose a unit performing the claimed elements, it is found unpersuasive because while the Office does not dispute that Benson does not explicitly disclose these units, as so stated in the previous Office action, the Office indicated that Benson discloses the related functions performed. Again, it has been the Office's position that if the GenBank system disclosed by Benson et al. performs a particular function, it would have been readily apparent and/or obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the system must have contained a unit performing such a function.